

REFERENCE

NBS TECHNICAL NOTE 774

STATES  
MENT OF  
MERCE  
ATION



# Fire Service Location-Allocation Models

U.S.  
TMENT  
OF  
MERCE

National  
au  
of  
ds

753  
774  
3

## NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The National Bureau of Standards<sup>1</sup> was established by an act of Congress March 3, 1901. The Bureau's overall goal is to strengthen and advance the Nation's science and technology and facilitate their effective application for public benefit. To this end, the Bureau conducts research and provides: (1) a basis for the Nation's physical measurement system, (2) scientific and technological services for industry and government, (3) a technical basis for equity in trade, and (4) technical services to promote public safety. The Bureau consists of the Institute for Basic Standards, the Institute for Materials Research, the Institute for Applied Technology, the Center for Computer Sciences and Technology, and the Office for Information Programs.

**THE INSTITUTE FOR BASIC STANDARDS** provides the central basis within the United States of a complete and consistent system of physical measurement; coordinates that system with measurement systems of other nations; and furnishes essential services leading to accurate and uniform physical measurements throughout the Nation's scientific community, industry, and commerce. The Institute consists of a Center for Radiation Research, an Office of Measurement Services and the following divisions:

Applied Mathematics — Electricity — Mechanics — Heat — Optical Physics —  
Linac Radiation<sup>2</sup> — Nuclear Radiation<sup>2</sup> — Applied Radiation<sup>2</sup> — Quantum  
Electronics<sup>3</sup> — Electromagnetics<sup>3</sup> — Time and Frequency<sup>3</sup> — Laboratory  
Astrophysics<sup>3</sup> — Cryogenics<sup>3</sup>.

**THE INSTITUTE FOR MATERIALS RESEARCH** conducts materials research leading to improved methods of measurement, standards, and data on the properties of well-characterized materials needed by industry, commerce, educational institutions, and Government; provides advisory and research services to other Government agencies; and develops, produces, and distributes standard reference materials. The Institute consists of the Office of Standard Reference Materials and the following divisions:

Analytical Chemistry—Polymers—Metallurgy—Inorganic Materials—Reactor  
Radiation—Physical Chemistry.

**THE INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED TECHNOLOGY** provides technical services to promote the use of available technology and to facilitate technological innovation in industry and Government; cooperates with public and private organizations leading to the development of technological standards (including mandatory safety standards), codes and methods of test; and provides technical advice and services to Government agencies upon request. The Institute also monitors NBS engineering standards activities and provides liaison between NBS and national and international engineering standards bodies. The Institute consists of a Center for Building Technology and the following divisions and offices:

Engineering and Product Standards—Weights and Measures—Invention and  
Innovation—Product Evaluation Technology—Electronic Technology—Technical  
Analysis—Measurement Engineering—Building Standards and Code Services<sup>4</sup>—  
Housing Technology<sup>4</sup>—Federal Building Technology<sup>4</sup>—Structures, Materials  
and Life Safety<sup>4</sup>—Building Environment<sup>4</sup>—Technical Evaluation and  
Application<sup>4</sup>—Fire Technology.

**THE INSTITUTE FOR COMPUTER SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY** conducts research and provides technical services designed to aid Government agencies in improving cost effectiveness in the conduct of their programs through the selection, acquisition, and effective utilization of automatic data processing equipment; and serves as the principal focus within the executive branch for the development of Federal standards for automatic data processing equipment, techniques, and computer languages. The Center consists of the following offices and divisions:

Information Processing Standards—Computer Information—Computer Services  
—Systems Development—Information Processing Technology.

**THE OFFICE FOR INFORMATION PROGRAMS** promotes optimum dissemination and accessibility of scientific information generated within NBS and other agencies of the Federal Government; promotes the development of the National Standard Reference Data System and a system of information analysis centers dealing with the broader aspects of the National Measurement System; provides appropriate services to ensure that the NBS staff has optimum accessibility to the scientific information of the world, and directs the public information activities of the Bureau. The Office consists of the following organizational units:

Office of Standard Reference Data—Office of Technical Information and  
Publications—Library—Office of International Relations.

<sup>1</sup> Headquarters and Laboratories at Gaithersburg, Maryland, unless otherwise noted; mailing address Washington, D.C. 20234.

<sup>2</sup> Part of the Center for Radiation Research.

<sup>3</sup> Located at Boulder, Colorado 80302.

<sup>4</sup> Part of the Center for Building Technology.

6 1973

acc - Ref

00

753

774

3

# Fire Service Location-Allocation Models

---

Donald Colner and David Gilsinn

Institute for Applied Technology  
National Bureau of Standards  
Washington, D.C. 20234

*U.S. 001*  
*†*  
*Technical note no. 774*

NBS Technical Notes are designed to supplement the Bureau's regular publications program. They provide a means for making available scientific data that are of transient or limited interest. Technical Notes may be listed or referred to in the open literature.



---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Frederick B. Dent, *Secretary*  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS, Richard W. Roberts, *Director*

Issued June 1973

**National Bureau of Standards Technical Note 774**

Nat. Bur. Stand. (U.S.), Tech. Note 774, 46 pages (June 1973)

CODEN: NBTNAE

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402  
(Order by SD Catalog No. C13.46:774).

Price \$0.75 domestic postpaid or \$0.50 G.P.O. Bookstore

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
1.1 Purpose of Report . . . . .	1
1.2 The Problem . . . . .	2
1.3 Report Content . . . . .	2
2.0 MAJOR LOCATION-ALLOCATION STUDIES . . . . .	4
2.1 Valinsky's Study. . . . .	4
2.2 Jane Hogg's Study . . . . .	5
2.3 East Lansing Study . . . . .	7
3.0 LOCATIONAL CONCEPTS. . . . .	9
3.1 Concept of Unit . . . . .	9
3.2 Concept of Jurisdiction . . . . .	10
3.3 Concepts of Demand Zones and Focal Points. . . . .	13
4.0 LOCATIONAL MODELS . . . . .	17
4.1 Initial Assumptions . . . . .	17
4.2 Weighted Time Models. . . . .	18
4.2.1 Basic Model. . . . .	20
4.2.2 Availability Model . . . . .	21
4.2.3 Multiple Dispatch Model. . . . .	24
4.3 Time-Constrained Models . . . . .	24
4.4 Balanced Workload Model . . . . .	26
5.0 MODEL HEURISTICS AND ALGORITHMS. . . . .	29
5.1 Complete Enumeration. . . . .	29
5.2 The Maranzana Heuristic . . . . .	29
5.2.1 Application to Models II, IIC. . . . .	30
5.2.2 Application to Models IV, IVC. . . . .	31
5.3 Model V Algorithm . . . . .	35
5.4 Model VII Heuristic . . . . .	26
6.0 SUMMARY. . . . .	39
REFERENCES. . . . .	40

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Fire Department Budgets, 1967, 1970 .....	3

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Phoenix County, Division into Areas on the Basis of Political and Natural Boundaries <u>Without</u> Mutual Aid .....	11
Figure 2. Sparks City, Division into Areas on the Basis of Qualitatively Distinct Firefighting Problems <u>Without</u> Mutual Aid .....	12
Figure 3. Phoenix County and Sparks City, Division into Areas that Cross Political Boundaries <u>With</u> Mutual Aid .....	14
Figure 4. Fire Demand Zones and Focal Points in Sparks City .....	16
Figure 5. Basic Fire Suppression Unit Response Times .....	19
Figure 6. Response Districts for Two Units .....	22
Figure 7. First and Second-Due District .....	33

# FIRE SERVICE LOCATION-ALLOCATION MODELS

Donald R. Colner  
David E. Gilsinn

This paper compiles the various types of location-allocation models which analyze the impact of varying the number and location of fire stations. The assumptions of each model, the relationships between models, and possible heuristics and algorithms are discussed. In addition, a methodology of spatial concepts analogous to those used in transportation planning is presented.

Key words: Algorithms; fire station location; heuristics; location-allocation models; location analysis; resource allocation analysis; transportation network analysis.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide such technical people as operations researchers, mathematicians, and planners with a perspective on analytical approaches to the fire station location problem.

The objective is to present generic classes of location-allocation models which use different objective functions as indicators of the level of service provided. This paper does not provide a detailed state-of-the-art review on location theory since there are adequate reviews in the literature. In particular, the paper by Revelle, Marks, and Liebman [1]<sup>1</sup> presents a general survey of the literature through 1969. To detail the various facets of fire service activities goes beyond the scope of this report, but the interested reader can gain some appreciation of the extensive and involved functions performed by fire departments by consulting their training manuals [2].

<sup>1</sup>Figures in brackets indicate the literature references at the end of this paper.

## 1.2 The Problem

City governments are being confronted with new and greater demands for public services at the same time as the cost of providing such services is steadily increasing. There are some indications, as noted in Table 1, that the fire service function is appropriating an increasingly larger portion of the overall city budget. Consequently, there is a pressing need for tools to analyze the delivery of fire services and find means to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

As cities grew from small communities, new facilities for fire services were gradually added at heavy demand points. Therefore, the fire stations often are not optimally located for the city as it currently exists. Similarly, as different parts of the city decay and suffer a negative growth rate, there is a need to re-examine the locational pattern of facilities.

Some method, more objective than the widely accepted usage of insurance ratings, by which a city can assess the adequacy of its level of fire protection is urgently needed. A necessary part of an objective approach would be the consideration of where facilities should be located and a measurement of the level of service provided, as a function of the number of facilities and their current locations. The models which address this problem are called location-allocation models. The difficulties of location-allocation analysis are dual. First, what is meant by the "level of service" or "effectiveness" of the fire department must be defined. Second, analytical means must be found to assess the relative benefits of different locational patterns.

## 1.3 Report Content

This report consists of six sections including the introduction. Section 2 gives brief summaries of three historic location-allocation studies. These studies demonstrate that the difficult problem of how many fire stations a city should have and where they should be located has received continued attention from the OR profession.

Section 3 determines what is to be located, (facilities, companies, equipment, or men), and provides a terminology for spatial characteristics to be used in the models. Section 4 describes several different types of location models; Section 5 discusses methods of providing solutions to these models. Section 6 summarizes the contributions of this paper.

Table 1

Fire Department Budgets [3]

1967, 1970

City	1967 F.D. Budget % of General Revenue	1970 F.D. Budget % of General Revenue	1970 Fire Expenditures (in thousands)	1970 Salaries % of F.D. Budget
Chicago, Ill.	10	12	\$ 68,478	98
Los Angeles, Cal.	12	12	62,348	98
New York City, N.Y.	3	4	233,296	100
Atlanta, Ga.	8	10	8,544	89
Pittsburgh, Pa.	10	13	11,181	98
St. Louis, Mo.	8	9	12,211	98
Washington, D. C.	3	4	22,683	94
Cincinnati, Ohio	5	5	11,215	96
Long Beach, Cal.	7	10	8,137	96
Miami, Fla.	13	19	7,619	100
Portland, Ore.	16	14	8,857	95
San Jose, Cal.	10	12	6,855	87
Wichita, Kan.	12	12	4,445	91
Baton Rouge, La.	12	10	3,246	89
Columbia, S.C.	15	18	1,391	94
Lansing, Mich.	27	13	3,325	91
Montgomery, Ala.	21	19	2,503	96
Richmond, Va.	5	7	5,620	77
Wichita Falls, Tex.	7	8	962	92

## 2.0 MAJOR LOCATION-ALLOCATION STUDIES

This section describes three location-allocation studies which represent milestones in the application of location theory to the fire services. The Valinsky study was done in the early 1950's for the city of New York. It used the A.I.A. [4] schedule as a constraint to determine the number and location of fire stations, supplemented by: (a) a crude hazard analysis, (b) availability analysis, and (c) a historical analysis of extreme situations of resource utilization to determine the risk of all units being used simultaneously. Jane Hogg's contribution was the use of an analytical model based upon network travel times and weighted demand points to locate stations. The Berlin-Santone study developed methodologies for (a) evaluating different location patterns, (b) hazard assessment, and (c) service districting.

### 2.1 Valinsky's Study

In 1951 David Valinsky was assigned to New York City's Mayor's Committee on Management Survey to examine the efficiency of fire company locations and determine whether or not statistical methods could usefully be applied to the entire problem of location.

The study consisted of four major tasks. First, Valinsky referenced the A.I.A. Standard Grading specifications for the location of apparatus and constructed an initial set of locations for the distribution of engine and ladder companies in New York that met the A.I.A. specifications. Since these standards were based primarily on the size of the areas to be protected with little consideration of such characteristics as population density and high-rise structures, the general A.I.A. specifications had to be reconsidered in the light of local conditions of special concern from a fire protection point of view.

The second task in the study was an analysis of burnable materials concerning the physical characteristics of structures and the special fire hazards of their occupancies. A block-by-block study of the entire area was required in order to determine the special characteristics which differentiate areas of similar geographic proportions as to their inherent risk potential. This phase of the study demonstrated that the distribution of companies as initially determined by the A.I.A. specifications was not totally adequate to meet the requirements of certain high hazard areas. Additional companies were located in such areas.

The third part of the study statistically analyzed the work load of the companies in order to determine the expected availability of the companies initially placed in the first two parts of the study. The geographic distributions of work performed were determined by studying the average number of runs, sizeable fires, and amount of time spent at work per year. Next, the amount of time at work and out-of-quarters was calculated, and the distribution of fire incidence by time and borough of New York was determined. Averages and absolute ranges of indicators of work performance such as the relation of unnecessary<sup>2</sup> alarms to working alarms by area were determined, as was the time consumed in runs. As a result, more companies were added to the ones located in the first two phases.

The final phase of the study was an analysis of the problems of mass response. Various indices were studied, including:

1. The distribution of multiple alarms
2. Fire losses
3. Fire fatalities
4. Probabilities of extreme fire situation.

The study determined the density of alarms by geographic location and time of occurrence, and evaluated the historical and anticipated incidence of multiple alarms with high loss potential. The probabilities inherent in these high loss situations were computed and resulted in the repositioning of some companies.

## 2.2 Jane Hogg's Study

In 1958, the Home Office in London, England received a request from Glasgow, Scotland to help plan fire station locations. Since central Glasgow was to be virtually flattened and rebuilt by the 1980's, there was a wide choice of possible station locations.

Jane Hogg, of the Scientific Advisor's Branch of the Home Office, chose the objective function of minimizing the total travel-time of all the engines traveling to fires, including both first responding engines and any reinforcements.

---

<sup>2</sup>"Unnecessary alarms" include malicious false alarms, good intent alarms, and accidental alarms.

Hogg indicated [5] that the response time to a fire depends on at least three factors:

1. The locale of the fire; i.e., the pattern of fire incidence
2. The location of the nearest station
3. The type of road network, and possible travel speed along the network.

The study first designated a large number of possible (initial) sites for stations, determined in such a way that political constraints were satisfied. The sites were fairly evenly scattered over Glasgow. Hogg chose to locate only one engine per location in order to obtain a lower total travel-time.

Next, she created a map depicting the projected incidence pattern in 1980, obtained through a regression analysis associating fire incidence with residential and working class populations. The map of the city was then divided into sub-areas composed of several one square kilometer cells of the map grid. She formed as many subareas as were feasible, yet large enough so that there would be a sufficient number of fires to enable the frequency distribution of engines called for service to be estimated.

Topographical features such as rivers, canals, and railway lines were considered in the creation of the subareas wherever they appeared to be barriers to passage. These boundary lines represented lines of low fire incidence. Each of the possible station sites was identified with a particular subarea.

Once the subareas had been delineated, the center of gravity of calls for each of the subareas was determined, and the travel times between the subareas and all possible station locations were computed.

Jane Hogg determined a set of locations from the set of possible sites which was a good choice for the total number of engines (in this case 41). She then eliminated the one site whose elimination increased the total response time by the least amount. Next, she eliminated a second site using the same criteria. The previously rejected site was compared with each of the retained sites. An exchange was made if it would reduce the total travel-time. The same procedure was repeated until the number of sites remaining equaled the number of units to be located. On each iteration, only single exchanges were allowed. As a result, the solution arrived at by this procedure was not necessarily the optimum solution.

### 2.3 East Lansing Study

Early in 1968, the International City Managers' Association, the American Society of Planning Officials, the Fels Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, and the Technical Analysis Division of the National Bureau of Standards initiated a Housing and Urban Development Department sponsored project to consider the applicability of systems analysis to the resolution of urban problems. The objective of the project was to demonstrate how city staffs, given adequate technical assistance and guidance, could use the methods of systems analysis to solve their particular problems. A study was conducted in East Lansing, Michigan to show how systems analysis could be applied to solving planning problems in fire departments. In particular, a computer model was developed by the Technical Analysis Division and the city's staff [6] as a tool for the city to use in planning the number and locations of fire stations.

The city staff and NBS analysts agreed that response time was an important factor to consider in planning the location of fire stations. It was determined that response time could be reduced both by increasing the number of fire stations and by strategically locating individual fire stations within their districts of responsibility.

The model, as developed, did not rigorously determine the number of fire stations required; however, it provided a means to evaluate the effectiveness of a particular configuration of fire district boundaries. The effort was essentially a districting, [7] rather than a location procedure. The model outputs gave information helpful in determining boundary changes which might lead to more balanced coverage by the fire stations.

The city of East Lansing was described by a highway network consisting of nodes and links, and by an indexed listing of all structures. Each structure was associated with one of the nodes of the network and represented a potential source of demand. The candidate fire station locations were located at a subset of the network nodes.

The study team developed an approach to explicitly rank alternative fire station locations. Once the specific locations had been chosen, the model would evaluate the objective function and determine service districts. The objective function was based on a combination of travel times from the proposed fire station locations to the node of demand, and the demand for fire protection at these nodes.

The travel times were estimated on the basis of shortest path travel throughout the street network. The demand for service at each node was defined as the sum of the demands at each individual structure assigned to a node. The demand for service at each structure was defined as the product of the probability that a fire would occur in that structure during a given interval of time (for example, a year), and the expected loss that would result from the fire. The probability of a fire occurring was estimated from fire history data and a regression model that included such variables as age, size, and construction type of buildings. The number of people at risk and the value of the building and contents was implicit in these variables. A similar approach was used to estimate the expected losses. Since the available data concerning losses to property referred to losses that occurred after a certain response time, travel time from the known fire station was incorporated as a variable in the function predicting the amount of loss.

The project team hypothesized a linear form for the demand for service at individual buildings, but made no attempt to define expected damage. Instead, the function was intended to reflect the relative importance of providing rapid response to a fire in a particular building. The variables in the linear function were determined by members of the city staff and analysts from the National Bureau of Standards. The values of the coefficients were determined, at a two-day session attended by city and fire department personnel, by ranking the importance of protecting typical structures such as schools, churches, and single family dwellings on a value scale. A set of linear equations was formulated relating the average judgment value to the characteristics of each structure.

### 3.0 LOCATIONAL CONCEPTS

In order to develop location-allocation models, it is necessary to discuss what is to be located and what spatial characteristics need to be considered.

#### 3.1 Concept of Unit

Some writers assume that it is the fire station that must be located, [8] some assume that it is the fire company, and still others the engine companies [9]. These may be entirely different problems to fire departments, One fire station, for instance, may contain several pumper and ladder companies.

Using a functional breakdown of fire department services, the following three categories of basic units are defined:

1. Fire Suppression Unit - That unit of apparatus, usually called an engine or pumper, complete with assigned manpower, in a particular jurisdictional area, whose primary function is the control and extinguishment of fires.
2. Fire Rescue Unit - That unit of apparatus, usually called a ladder or a truck, whose primary function is the rescue of persons from sites above the first floor level.
3. Special Support Unit - That unit of personnel or special apparatus and equipment used to support the other types of units in conducting their missions.

Pumper companies, however, often conduct salvage, overhaul, and rescue activities in addition to fire suppression. Similarly, ladder companies often do ventilation, salvage, and overhaul.<sup>3</sup> The definitions are intended to abstract the basic functional units from the various particular apparatus and manpower configurations.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ventilation, salvage, overhaul, and rescue are technical fire department terminology. Ventilation is the planned and systematic removal of smoke, gases, and heat from a structure. Salvage refers to the covering or removal of goods which may be damaged by fire or water. Overhaul refers to the practice of searching for any sparks, embers, or fire that may remain in a building, or in any structure, place, or thing that may have been subject to a fire. Rescue refers to extracting and caring for persons trapped and/or injured in structures, vehicles, traffic accidents, train wrecks, airplane crashes, floods, wind storms and earthquakes.

### 3.2 Concept of Jurisdiction

It is assumed that a fire department serves a bounded geographical jurisdiction made up of contiguous subareas separated by natural or man-made boundaries. A jurisdiction is defined as a bounded geographic area that may or may not be internally separated by such things as mountain ranges, rivers, or railroad tracks.

Natural barriers may divide a geo-political region into areas which the fire department views as unconnected. To illustrate this point, a hypothetical city and county will be described. Figure 1 shows hypothetical Phoenix County divided by a river and a mountain range. Frequent flooding in the spring and summer prevents fire apparatus from using the bridges often enough that a fire department will not consider an engine company on one side of the river as offering protection to the other side. The mountain range cannot be crossed in less than fifteen minutes. Therefore, the two sides of the river may be considered as disconnected for the purpose of locational analysis, and a separate location study performed for each side of the river. Finally, suppose the region of the county below the mountain range is essentially divided into two areas because of a lack of connecting roads. Each of the above considerations makes it either necessary (as in the case of the Smoky River), or desirable (from the computational point of view), to analyze each area separately. The geographical divisions described above might be appropriate in rural counties which do not have mutual aid agreements with surrounding jurisdictions.

A region can also be divided for analysis into areas with qualitatively different fire problems. Figure 2 illustrates the situation in hypothetical Sparks City. The downtown sector of the city contains many high-rise buildings which necessitate ladders and rescue equipment, as well as a large capacity for water delivery. The companies in the industrial area, on the other hand, need foam capability and larger water supplies than the residential part of the city. The area divisions in this example affect the locational analysis in the sense that a greater importance will be assigned to one area than another. As Figure 2 indicates, Sparks City is affected by both a geographical division, and the qualitative fire problem division. An analyst might perform two location analyses in this example, one for each side of the river. On the side of the river containing Areas I and III, he would perform a single location analysis, weighting the demands from Area I in a different manner from those of Area III. (For the example, it is assumed that such weightings can be determined.)

Figure 1

Phoenix County  
Division into Areas on the Basis of Political  
and Natural Boundaries Without Mutual Aid






Figure 2

Sparks City  
Division into Areas on the Basis of Qualitatively  
Distinct Firefighting Problems Without Mutual Aid



Boundary between fire protection areas

The previous examples have indicated two ways (quantitative and geographic) of partitioning jurisdictions for locational analysis. A jurisdiction, such as Sparks City, may require division by both methods.

If Phoenix County and Sparks City have a mutual aid agreement which makes the nearest engine company responsible for responding to alarms without regard to geo-political boundaries, analysis areas which cross political boundaries are feasible. This situation might be partitioned as in Figure 3.

Although the references to Phoenix County and Sparks City are entirely hypothetical, such instances are typical. For example, Dade County, Florida exhibits some of these problems. Dade County consists of 27 jurisdictions without central dispatch to all areas, so that individual jurisdictions cannot always rely on mutual aid. A further complication arises from the causeways across to Miami Beach which have drawbridges. The fire departments must consider the possibility of a drawbridge being raised at a critical time; namely, when a fire engine is responding to an alarm.

### 3.3 Concepts of Demand Zones and Focal Points

It is necessary to develop means for specifying the spatial distribution of demand for service within a given jurisdiction. The models in this paper are based on the two concepts of fire demand zones and focal points.


A fire demand zone represents an area of a city with relatively homogeneous land use. The demand for fire service for the zone is assumed to occur at one point called the focal point. The concepts of fire demand zones and focal points are analogous to the concepts of traffic demand zones and centroids used in the transportation sciences.

These concepts can be made operational in the following manner:

1. The ultimate size of the fire demand zone should be related to a non-critical travel time. For example, if the city considers that 30 seconds is a critical response time, the fire demand zone should not be larger than 30 seconds driving time.
2. A fire demand zone can be a single complex of buildings; e.g., a factory producing or using hazardous materials, a church or a hospital, or an area of relatively homogeneous structures.

Figure 3

Phoenix County and Sparks City  
Division into Areas that Cross Political Boundaries  
With Mutual Aid




3. The focal points are chosen to be points within the fire demand zone representing the principal hazard for that zone, or the centroid of the zone computed by weighting all hazards in the zone. A hospital, as a significant entity within a residential area, could be treated in two ways. First, an area of the residential community containing the hospital satisfying the travel time criteria for that particular city could be marked off, and the focal point for that zone placed at the hospital. Second, the hospital may be treated as a separate fire demand zone within another fire demand zone representing the residential area. In this case, two focal points would be placed, one at the hospital and another, perhaps at the centroid, for the residential area.
4. A street network is assumed to exist for the jurisdiction, and a focal point will generally be a node of the street network.
5. A measure of importance is associated with each focal point. Different measures are needed for various models. For example, the measure could be the number of calls for service originating at the focal point, or a sum of the different types of calls weighted by the hazard to life or property represented by that type.

The resource and time constraint models will require a measure which gives a maximum travel time from the nearest facility to the focal point, or a measure requiring  $K$  basic suppression units to respond within  $L$  minutes.

Figure 4 illustrates how fire demand zones and focal points might appear in the residential area of Sparks City without mutual aid (see Figure 2). The fire demand zones,  $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4, Z_5, Z_6$ , each have a focal point,  $f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6$ . This is only an illustration of how one area could be partitioned. For example, the high value area of Sparks City may have much smaller fire demand zones, possibly on the order of a block in size, indicating the importance of a response to the associated focal points.

Figure 4

Fire Demand Zones and Focal Points in Sparks City



- $f_1$  : Shopping Center
- $f_2$  : Farm Community
- $f_3$  : Gas Station in a Suburban Community
- $f_4$  : Church in a Farm Community
- $f_5$  : Grain Storage Elevator
- $f_6$  : Farm Community

## 4.0 LOCATIONAL MODELS

This section describes the major variations of location models proposed for fire suppression unit location, and provides a discussion of their relationships.

First, an initial list of assumptions to be used in the models is presented. The remaining subsections discuss variations of the basic weighted-time model, time constrained models, and balanced workload models, respectively.

The models considered share several general characteristics. All of the models rely on the response times of the units involved, rather than on their response distances as used in the A.I.A. Standard Grading approach. The response time in the models will notationally be identified by  $T_{ij}$ , where  $T_{ij}$  refers to the shortest average travel time from facility location  $j$  to the focal point of fire demand zone  $i$ . These times can be generated by applying shortest path algorithms to specific city street networks.

The models evaluate alternative locations of a finite number of existing and potential fire suppression unit location in terms of the given objective function. The locations are assumed to be coincident with nodes in the city's transportation network. Finally, all of the models weight the fire demand zones by the degree and type of hazards represented by the land use pattern of the zones. Some of the models employ the weights directly in the function to be optimized, while others employ weights implicitly as time constraints.

### 4.1 Initial Assumptions

This section furnishes a fundamental list of the assumptions made in applying the location models. Additional assumptions necessary for some of the models are discussed in context.<sup>4</sup>

- (a) Each fire suppression unit is assigned to one station at a fixed location (node), and that unit responds to all calls for service from its assigned station. Consequently, the models considered in this report do not apply to units which respond to an alarm while on patrol, or from any other place than their fixed locations.

---

<sup>4</sup>The assumptions will be lettered (a), (b), etc., so that the required assumptions for a particular model can be referred to by letter rather than repeated.

- (b) The units are indistinguishable and equivalent.
- (c) The units are indivisible. In many fire departments, the fire suppression units consist of more than one piece of apparatus. In some situations, the unit can be split and each of the sub-units used at a different location. This tactic is particularly useful in fighting brush fires and fires where there is exposure to other buildings. The models described in this paper, however, assume that each unit will be engaged in its entirety, at a single location.
- (d) A given fire demand zone focal point is served from the closest unit location. This assumption reflects the usual practice of the fire services.
- (e) Alarms, or calls for service, will originate at a finite collection of focal points,  $f_i$ ;  $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ , ( $n$  being the total number of focal points chosen to represent the fire demand zones).
- (f) Potential locations for the basic fire suppression units are restricted to a finite set of points in the network denoted by  $E = \{e_j; j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , called stations (or more precisely, "potential fire station locations"). Generally,  $m \leq n$ .
- (g) The travel-time  $T_{ij} \geq 0$ , required for a unit at  $e_j$  to respond to an alarm at the focal point  $f_i$ , is known for all  $i$  and  $j$ . These travel times are illustrated in Figure 5.


#### 4.2 Weighted Time Models

The models in this section attempt to minimize the disutility associated with selection of stations for a given number of serving units. If  $f_i$  is to be served by a unit at  $e_j$ , the disutility associated with this assignment is assumed to be of the form:

$$W_i \cdot T_{ij}$$

where  $W_i$  is some measure of the importance of providing a rapid response at  $f_i$ . In particular, it is assumed for those models with a disutility function that:

Figure 5  
Basic Fire Suppression Unit Response Times



$f_i$  = Locations of the focal points  
for the fire demand zones;  
 $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$

$e_1$  = Proposed fire station location

$T_{i1}$  = Time from  $e_1$  to  $f_i$

- (h)  $W_i$  = the expected number of alarms at the focal point  $f_i$  over a specified length of time, for example a year, is known.

To facilitate the exposition, it is necessary to introduce some notations. For the location of  $M$  units (where  $M$  is the actual number of basic fire suppression units to be located) from  $m$  possible locations;  $\{e_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ ,  $M < m$ , and one unit is to be assigned to each location.

There are  $\binom{m}{M}^5$  subsets of the set of possible station locations consisting of  $M$  distinct elements; that is, the number of different ways of choosing  $M$  locations from  $m$  possible sites. For notational purposes let:

$$M_m = \binom{m}{M}.$$

Let  $E_k$  represent the  $k^{\text{th}}$  subset of the  $M_m$  subsets of  $E$  which consist of exactly  $M$  distinct stations. That is,  $k$  indexes a particular subset, called  $E_k$ , of the set  $\{e_j: j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , where  $k = 1, 2, \dots, M_m$ . For notational purposes let:

$$e_{kj} = \text{the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ element in subset } E_k.$$

#### 4.2.1 Basic Model

First consider a special case in which a fire department jurisdiction, represented by  $n$  focal points,  $\{f_i: i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . If it is assumed that alarms occur at such times that the fire suppression unit is always available when required, then the unit can be located by determining that location among the  $m$  possible choices which will satisfy

$$\text{Min}_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i T_{ij}. \quad [\text{Model I}]$$

---

<sup>5</sup>  $\binom{m}{M}$  is the binomial coefficient:  $\binom{m}{M} = \frac{m!}{(m-M)!M!}$

Model I assumes (a-c) and (e-h), as well as:

- (i) A fire suppression unit is available whenever one is required.

and

- (j) Only one unit is required to respond to each alarm.

This model may seem naive, but it is appropriate for many small communities in the United States.

A logical extension of Model I is the location of several fire suppression units. For this model, assumptions (a-j) are used and the total travel time for the M basic fire suppression units is minimized. Thus, the objective function of Model II is:

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq M_m} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \min_{j \in E_k} \{T_{ik} | e_k \in E_k\}. \quad [\text{Model II}]$$

This model is relevant to residential communities which require large numbers of stations, and which have sufficient resource availability to insure the validity of assumptions (d) and (i).

Two constraints on Model II are obvious; namely, the assumptions that the closest unit is available, and that only one unit responds to each alarm. The next subsection discusses a procedure for relaxing the first assumption.

#### 4.2.2 Availability Model


This formulation uses the locations determined by the basic model and divides the region to be served into districts, each of which is served exclusively by one station. The districts are determined so as to minimize the total expected travel time.

Carter, Chaiken, and Ignall have constructed a simple model in which the nearest unit is not assumed to be always available. Their model describes a region served by two units at fixed locations 1 and 2 as illustrated in Figure 6. In addition to the previous assumptions (a-h) and (j), they assume that:

- (k) The arrival of alarms is a Poisson process.

Figure 6

Response Districts for Two Units



- (l) The mean service time is independent of the location of the alarm and the basic fire suppression unit servicing the alarm.
- (m) A part of the region R (Figure 6) has been identified as the district assigned to a unit located at 1. The district assigned to Unit 1 will be called A, the district assigned to Unit 2 will be referred to as B. Furthermore, these two units are assumed to be dispatched according to the following rules:
- (1) The two units will respond only to alarms in the region.
  - (2) A unit, if available, will respond to all alarms in its own district.
  - (3) A unit, if available, will respond to an alarm in the other unit's district whenever that unit is unavailable.
  - (4) When both units are unavailable, alarms will be served by units outside of B.

Under the previous assumptions, Carter et al. showed that the area (or focal points) to be included in district A in order to minimize the total expected travel time is:

$$A = \{f_i \in R \mid T_{i1} - T_{i2} \leq K\} \quad [\text{Model III}]$$

where

$$K = \frac{\lambda n}{\lambda - \mu} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (T_{i1} - T_{i2}) W_i \right)$$

$\lambda$  = mean arrival rate of alarms

$\mu$  = mean service time.

This model is not directly applicable to most resource location problems because of the limitation on the number of units considered.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>New results relaxing this constraint have been announced by Chaiken and Larson at the 40th National ORSA meeting, Oct. 27-29, 1971. However, these results have not yet been published.

### 4.2.3 Multiple Dispatch Model

In this section, a model will be discussed which relaxes the assumption that only one unit is required on all alarms. If the assumptions of Model II are modified to allow for a probability,  $q_i$ , that a second unit will be required at  $f_i$ , and that the unit will be available when required, the total travel time for a given number of units can be minimized by stationing these units at the locations which satisfy:

$$\text{Min}_{1 \leq k \leq M_m} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \min \{T_{ik_r} + q_i T_{ik_s} \mid e_{k_r}, e_{k_s} \in E_k, r \neq s\}.$$

[Model IV]

Model IV includes assumptions (a-j),<sup>7</sup> and the new assumption:

- (n) A second basic fire suppression unit may be required on an alarm at  $f_i$ . The probability of requiring the second unit on an alarm at  $f_i$  is designated by  $q_i$ .

Model IV could clearly be extended to include probabilities that three or more units are required for each alarm.

### 4.3 Time-Constrained Models

The conventional approach to the fire station location problem is derived from the A.I.A. standards which require that a station be located within a given number of miles of each focal point. The required distances may vary with the "value" of the fire demand zone. Therefore, models which constrain the maximum allowable distance between a fire demand zone and its serving unit(s) are of interest. Mitchell [10] suggests one feasible approach to modeling these constraints using time rather than distance as a consideration.

Assume that there is a maximum allowable travel time associated with each focal point:

- (o)  $T_i$  = Maximum time constraint for a response to  $f_i$ :  
 $i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$

---

<sup>7</sup>Under assumption (i), it is implicitly included that the first and second nearest units are available whenever required.

In order to insure compliance with these constraints, define a penalty function,  $G$ , in the following manner:

$$G(i, t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \leq T_i \\ \alpha & \text{if } t > T_i; \text{ where } \alpha \text{ is a large value.} \end{cases}$$

This penalty function can be appended to the objective function in Models I, II, or IV in order to create time-constrained versions of these models as follows:

$$(IC) \quad \text{Min}_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_i T_{ij} + G(i, T_{ij})).$$

Assumptions for (IC): (a-j), (o).

$$(IIC) \quad \text{Min}_{1 \leq k \leq M_m} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \text{Min} \{T_{ik_j} + G(i, T_{ik_j}) \mid e_{k_j} \in E_k\}.$$

Assumptions for (IIC): (a-k), (o).

$$(IVC) \quad \text{Min}_{1 \leq k \leq M_m} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \text{Min} \{T_{ik_r} + q_i T_{ik_s} + G(i, T_{ik_r}) \mid$$

$$e_{k_r}, e_{k_s} \in E_k, r \neq s\}.$$

Assumptions for (IVC): (a-k), (n,o)

Model IVC could be extended by appending a second penalty function associated with the travel time of the second closest basic fire suppression unit,  $T_{ik_s}$ . Furthermore, alternative

functional forms for the penalty function,  $G$ , could be analyzed in place of the  $\{0, \alpha\}$  function.

A different approach to the time-constrained model has been suggested by Toregas, et al. [11]. They formulate the problem as locating the minimum number of fire suppression units in order to insure that each focal point,  $f_i$ , lies within a prespecified service time,  $b_i$ . In particular, define:

$b_i$  = the upper bound on the initial response time of a first due unit to focal point  $f_i$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

The objective of this approach is to minimize the number of units required to satisfy the time constraints.

In order to formulate the model, additional definitions are required:

$U$  = the set of possible unit locations

$Y_j = 1$  if a unit is located at  $e_j$  and 0 otherwise, where  $e_j \in U$ .

$N_i = \{j \in U \mid T_{ij} \leq b_i\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and  $T_{ij}$  is the shortest path time from focal point  $f_i$  to unit location  $e_j$ .  $N$  is not an empty set for all  $i$ .

The problem of identifying the minimum number of unit locations which can provide the desired level of service can be formulated as:<sup>8</sup>

$$\text{Min } \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j \quad [\text{Model V}]$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{j \in N_i} Y_j \geq 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

where  $Y_j = 1$  or 0, for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

The assumptions for Model V are (a-g), (i), and (o).

#### 4.4 Balanced Workload Model

The balanced workload model (Model VI) is a variation on the weighted time model (Model II). The principal difference between these two models is the rule for determining which fire suppression unit will respond at each of the FDZ's. In the weighted time model this rule follows from the assumption that an alarm is serviced from the closest unit location. In the balanced workload model this assumption is replaced by:

---

<sup>8</sup> A similar formulation has been suggested to the authors by Dr. William Horn, Applied Mathematics Division, National Bureau of Standards.

- (p) The workload at  $f_i$  is directly proportional to  $W_i$ , and each fire suppression unit will be assigned the same total workload.

The model requires the following definitions:

$W_i$  = weight associated with the workload at focal point  $f_i$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,

$T_{ij}$  = shortest average route time between focal point  $f_i$  and unit  $j$  at  $e_j$ , where  $e_j$  is location of the  $j$ -th unit.

$Y_{ij}$  = the fraction of the workload at focal point  $f_i$  assigned to unit  $j$  at  $e_j$ .

If it is assumed that each incident represents one unit of work for the unit servicing the incident, the expected frequency of incidents at  $f_i$  can be used for the value of  $W_i$ .

If however, the average service time required differs significantly for the different FDZ's, a more complex interpretation of the  $W_i$ 's is required. This discussion assumes that the number of incidents served by a unit measures the work accomplished by that unit.

If the locations for  $M$  units are given, the problem of drawing the district boundaries so as to minimize the total travel time while balancing the workload can be formulated as follows:

$$\text{Min } \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^M T_{ij} W_i Y_{ij}, \quad [\text{Model VI}]$$

subject to 
$$\sum_{j=1}^M Y_{ij} = 1; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n W_i Y_{ij} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, M.$$

where,  $Y_{ij}$  = the fraction of the workload at focal point  $f_i$  assigned to the unit located at  $e_j$ .

The assumptions for Model VI are (a-c), (e-j) and (p).

Model VI is not a location model; it is only an allocation model. The extension of Model VI to a location-allocation model is described below as Model VII. Model VI is solvable.<sup>9</sup> However, the solution may require that the workload at one or more of  $f_i$ 's be divided among fire suppression units in order to insure a balanced workload.

The extension of Model VI to a location-allocation model requires the selection of locations for M units from a set of m possibilities so as to minimize Model VI. The new problem can be formulated as a quadratic program:

$$\text{Min } \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m T_{ij} W_i Y_{ij} X_j \quad [\text{Model VII}]$$

subject to

$$\sum_{j=1}^m Y_{ij} X_j = 1; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m X_j \leq M,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n W_i Y_{ij} X_j \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i; \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

where  $X_j = 1$  if a unit is located at j, and 0 otherwise.

---

<sup>9</sup>The solution method is discussed in Section 5.4 as the districting step in the heuristic for Model VII.

## 5.0 MODEL HEURISTICS AND ALGORITHMS

Each of the models discussed above can be associated with an algorithm or a heuristic which will select locations for the units according to their respective criteria. Despite the large number of models presented, a small number of solution techniques can accommodate all of them.

These techniques are:

1. Complete enumeration
2. Maranzana heuristic
3. Integer Programming
4. Transportation Algorithm

### 5.1 Complete Enumeration

When the number of possible choices is small, it is feasible to calculate the value of the objective function for each of the alternatives. This approach has been used by Berlin and Santone [12] in applying Model I. Note that in Model I the number of alternatives is  $m$ ; i.e., the number of possible locations at which to locate the one unit.

Complete enumeration, where feasible, has an important advantage over more sophisticated computational procedures for identifying the optimum locations. If the value of the objective function is computed for each alternative, the alternatives can be ranked. This process identifies not only the best choice, but also the second, third, and fourth best choices and differences in the value of their objective functions.

It should be noted that Models II, IIC, IV, and IVC may also be solved by complete enumeration as long as  $M_m$ , the number of alternatives, does not get so large as to make the required number of computations too time consuming.

### 5.2 The Maranzana Heuristic

Several authors have suggested the use of a heuristic developed by Maranzana [13] for models such as Model II [14]. The heuristic consists of locating basic fire suppression units at an arbitrary initial selection of  $M$  of the  $m$  stations, then partitioning the focal points into districts such that all points in a district are served from the same location. Next, for each district, the set of possible station locations is examined to determine if the value of the objective function in that district can be reduced by selecting one of the alternative locations for the unit

servicing the district. Finally, if new locations are chosen for some of the units, the redistricting is repeated and the process is continued until it fails to recommend new locations for the units.

### 5.2.1 Application to Models II, IIC

More precisely, with respect to Model II, the heuristic consists of the following steps:

#### 1. Initialize

Make an initial arbitrary selection,

$$E_1 = \{e_{1j} \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$$

of  $M$  of the  $m$  possible station locations in  $E$ .

#### 2. District

Assign each  $f_i$  to one and only one of the stations in  $E_1$  in order to form districts. Let  $p$  be an index representing one of the units. Form the  $p$ -th district as follows: Define,

$$D_p = \{f_i \mid T_{i1} \leq T_{i1_j} \text{ ; } j = 1, 2, \dots, M\},$$

where  $p = 1, 2, \dots, M$ . That is, assign each focal point to the nearest servicing unit. Furthermore, suppose that unit location  $e_{1_1}$  is associated with district  $D_1$ ;  $e_{1_2}$  is associated with  $D_2$ ; etc. If some focal point should be equidistant from two or more units, arbitrarily assign this point to the district of the unit that appears first in the list.

#### 3. Move

Examine the set of possible unit locations,  $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^m$  for a new set of  $M$  locations which best serve each district  $D_p$ ;  $p = 1, 2, \dots, M$ . This is done by choosing the locations in order to satisfy:

$$(*) \quad \text{Min}_{1 \leq j \leq M} \sum_{f_i \in D_p} W_i \text{ Min} \{T_{ik_j} \mid e_{k_j} \in E_k\}$$

This procedure may be accomplished by a complete enumeration. Let  $E_2$  be the set of  $M$  new unit locations which satisfy condition (\*), where

$$E_2 = \{e_{2j} | j = 1, 2, \dots, M\}.$$

#### 4. Terminate

If the unit location has been changed in any of the districts, return to step 2, otherwise stop.

#### 5.2.2 Application to Models IV and IVC

A variation on the Maranzana heuristic is also applicable to Models IV and IVC. In order to make this extension of the heuristic, it is necessary to supplement the concept of district,  $D_p$ , defined above. In this section,  $D_p$  is defined as the "first-due district," and  $D_p^2$  is defined as the "second-due district." In an intuitive manner, a second-due district can be thought of as a set of next nearest focal points to a basic suppression unit, say Unit 1. Thus, there would be a set of focal points falling in the first-due district of some other fire suppression unit; e.g. Unit 2, but closer to Unit 1 than to Units 3, 4, ...,  $M$ .

Formally, define  $D_p^2$ ;  $p = 1, 2, \dots, M$  as follows:

$$D_p^2 = \{f_i | f_i \notin D_p \text{ and for some } p', (p' \neq p, 1 \leq p' \leq M), \\ f_i \in D_{p'}, \text{ and } T_{ip'} \leq T_{ir}, (r \neq p, 1 \leq r \leq M)\}.$$

Although this is a formal mathematical definition, it can be given an operational interpretation. A focal point  $f_i$  belongs to the second-due district  $D_p^2$  of some unit indexed  $p$ , provided

1.  $f_i$  is not in the first-due district  $D_p$  of the unit  $p$ , but falls in the first-due district of some other unit  $p'$ ,  $D_{p'}$ , where  $p' \neq p$ ,
2. the following condition on the response times to focal point  $f_i$  is satisfied:

$$T_{ip} \leq T_{ip'} \leq T_{ij},$$

where  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ ,  $\{p \neq p'\}$ .

Figure 7 displays an intuitive pictorial view. The figure depicts three units located at points 1, 2, 3, in a circular jurisdiction with distances measured by straight lines. The associated first-due districts,  $D_1, D_2, D_3$ , are delineated by solid lines. The second due district for Unit 1,  $D_1^2$ , is represented by the shaded area. Thus, the shaded area in  $D_2$  is nearer to Unit 1 than to Unit 3, and the shaded area in  $D_3$  is nearer to Unit 1 than to Unit 2. Similar shadings could be constructed for Units 2 and 3.

Using this definition the Maranzana heuristic can be reformulated to apply to Model IV as follows:

1. Initialize

Make an arbitrary selection of  $M$  possible unit locations from the possible locations  $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^M$ . As before, designate this set as  $E_1 = \{e_{1j} \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$ . These will be the initial locations for the  $M$  units.

2. District

For each unit  $p \quad p = 1, 2, \dots, M$ , partition the focal points into first-due districts.

$$D_p = \{f_i \mid T_{i1p} \leq T_{i1j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, M\},$$

where  $D_p$  is the first-due district for unit  $p$ ;  $p = 1, 2, \dots, M$ . Also, partition the focal points into second-due districts<sup>10</sup>


$$D_p^2 = \{f_i \mid f_i \notin D_p \text{ and for some } p', (p' \neq p, 1 \leq p' \leq M),$$

$$f_i \in D_{p'}, \text{ and } T_{ip'} \leq T_{ir'}, (r \neq p, 1 \leq r \leq M)\}.$$

<sup>10</sup> Again, it is necessary to consider the case in which a focal point is equidistant from two or more units in order to ensure that the  $D_p$  (also  $D_p^2$ ) sets partition the focal points. When this is the case, this focal point is arbitrarily assigned to the unit with the smallest unit number  $p$ .

Figure 7

First and Second-Due Districts



1, 2, 3: Unit locations

$D_1, D_2, D_3$ : First-Due Districts for Units 1, 2, 3, respectively

$D_1^2$ : Second-Due District - Unit 1

### 3. Move

As in Section 4.2.1, look for an alternative location for each unit. Unit  $p$  will be moved to a new location if there is some station in the list  $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^m$  which reduces the value of the objective function for the points served by unit  $p$ . This objective is given by:

$$\text{Min} \\ (**) \quad 1 \leq j \leq m \quad \left( \sum_{f_i \in D_p} W_i T_{ij} + \sum_{f_i \in D_p^2} W_i q_i T_{ij} \right).$$

Let  $E_2$  be the set of  $M$  new unit locations which satisfy condition (\*\*), where:

$$E_2 = \{e_{2_j} \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, M\}.$$

Again  $e_{2_1}$  is associated with  $D_1$  and  $D_1^2$ ;  $e_{2_2}$  is associated with  $D_2$  and  $D_2^2$ ; etc. If  $e_{2_p} \neq e_{1_p}$ , move unit  $e_{1_p}$  to  $e_{2_p}$ .<sup>11</sup>

### 4. Reiterate

If none of the units have been moved in step 3, the heuristic terminates. Otherwise, return to step 2 and continue.

As with the Maranzana algorithm this heuristic does not necessarily achieve an absolute minimum for the objective function. It does achieve some form of a "local" minimum.

This heuristic may also be applicable to Model IV with condition (\*\*) replaced by the new objective:

$$\text{Min} \\ (***) \quad 1 \leq j \leq m \quad \left( \sum_{f_i \in D_p} [W_i T_{ij} + G(i, T_{ij})] + \sum_{f_i \in D_p^2} W_i q_i T_{ij} \right).$$

However, it is possible that this heuristic will fail in step 2. In fact, the value of the objective function in (\*\*\*) may be infinity for all possible locations for one of the units. This may occur in cases where there is a solution for Model IVC with no finite value of the objective function.

---

<sup>11</sup>Again, the objective function at  $e_{2_p}$  must be less than the value of the objective function at  $e_{1_p}$  and not equal. Otherwise the heuristic may cycle and not converge.

This difficulty may be overcome by replacing the arbitrary selection of initial locations in step 1 with an initial selection of locations based on Model V. This can be accomplished to insure a finite value for each of the objective functions (\*\*\*) for some values of M. A computational procedure for accomplishing this will be explained in the next section.

### 5.3 Model V Algorithm

Toregas, ReVelle, Swain, and Bergman (see footnote [11]) describe a simple algorithm for solving Model V in some of the cases where the number of units required to serve each focal point is one. Their algorithm consists of applying a linear program to Model V, with additional cuts if necessary:

Step 1: Let the problem be described by:

$$\text{Min } \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j,$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{j \in N_i} y_j \geq 1; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where  $y_j = 1$  or  $0$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and

$N_i; i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  have been defined as in Section 4.3.

Step 2: Apply a linear program to the problem.<sup>12</sup>

Step 3: If the solutions  $y_j$  are all integers, the problem is solved. If one or more of  $y_j$  are not integers, define  $M_0$ , the number of units required, by:

$$M_0 = \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j.$$

If  $M_0$  is an integer while one or more of the  $y_j$  are non-integral, the algorithm fails to produce a solution to Model V. However, Toregas, et al., report never encountering this situation in

<sup>12</sup>Toregas, et al, report that a mathematical programming code is available for an IBM S/360.

their experience with the algorithm.

If  $M_0$  is not an integer, add an integral cut to the problem. The new problem is:

$$\text{Minimize } \sum_{j=1}^n y_j$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{j \in N_i} y_j \geq 1, y_i \geq 0 \text{ for each } i; i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

$$\text{and } \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \geq [M_0] + 1,$$

where  $[M_0]$  is the largest integer which is smaller than  $M_0$ . Continue the algorithm by repeating steps 2 and 3.

This algorithm cannot continue indefinitely since on each iteration  $\sum_{j=1}^n y_j$  must increase beyond the next integer greater than  $\sum_{j=1}^n y_j$ , but cannot increase beyond  $m$ .

#### 5.4 Model VII Heuristic

One approach to Model VII has been suggested<sup>13</sup> which makes direct use of the transportation problem. In this formulation, begin by assigning a portion  $W_{ij}$  of the workload ( $W_i$ ) of each focal point to each of the possible fire station locations,  $e_j$ , which constrain the utilization of each location. This can be accomplished by solving the transportation problem for the values of  $W_{ij}$  which

$$\text{minimize } \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m T_{ij} W_{ij}$$

<sup>13</sup> By Dr. George Suzuki, Technical Analysis Division, National Bureau of Standards.

subject to  $\sum_{j=1}^n W_{ij} = W_i$  for each  $i$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

$$\text{and } \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n W_i}{M}$$

Define the cost of this system of  $m$  fire stations to be

$$D_m = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m T_{ij} W_{ij},$$

where the values of the  $W_{ij}$  have been determined by solving the transportation problem.

One method of solving Model VII would be to compute the costs,  $D_m^k$ ;  $k = 1, 2, \dots, \binom{m}{M}$ , associated with each subset containing  $M$  of the possible fire station locations using the method described by Srinivasan and Thompson [15]. The set of  $M$  locations of least cost solves Model VII. However, this approach may prove impractical because of the computation times required. For example, if a problem requiring the selection of the best 10 out of 20 possible locations takes ten seconds to evaluate each possibility, it would take 21 days to evaluate all of the possibilities. As a result, it is necessary to investigate heuristics for solving Model VII.

One method for arriving at a set of  $M$  stations consists of first solving the transportation problem for the  $m$  stations as described above, and defining the utilization

$$U_j = \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}$$

associated with each location. The set of possible locations is reduced by eliminating the least utilized location. This procedure is repeated on the remaining locations until only  $M$  stations remain.

Another heuristic for Model VII has been programmed. This program is referred to as REDIST [16], and the general steps of the heuristic are given as follows:

1. Estimate the initial locations of the units to be placed.

2. Use a transportation algorithm to assign focal points to fire suppression units in order to minimize the sum of the weighted response times. This is the districting step.
3. Adjust these assignments so that each focal point lies entirely within one unit district. Although this process usually destroys the equal distribution workload, it uniquely defines districts.
4. Reassign focal points between districts in order to improve workload equality.
5. Compute new unit locations within each district as new trial locations. The program returns to step 2 until the solution converges.

## 6.0 SUMMARY

The objective of this paper has been to compile and review tools that can be used in locating fire suppression units. The specific contributions of this paper are:

1. A terminology of spatial concepts to use in locational analysis.
2. A specification of different types of location-allocation models and their assumptions.
3. A discussion of how each type of model relates to the others.
4. Discussions of heuristics and algorithms to be used with the models.

In addition, it is hoped that the paper will stimulate work on more efficient algorithms and on relating the locational problems to overall resource allocation problems.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Revelle, D. Marks, and J. Leibman, "An Analysis of Private and Public Sector Location Models," Management Science, XVI (1970).
- [2] See, for example:
- (a) J. F. Casey, ed., The Fire Chief's Handbook, Third Edition (New York: The Reuben J. Donnelley Corp., 1968).
  - (b) L. W. Erven, Fire Company Apparatus and Procedures (Beverly Hills, California: Glencoe Press, 1969).
- [3] International City Management Association, The Municipal Year Book (Washington, D. C.: International City Management Association, 1967, 1971).
- [4] The American Insurance Association Standard Grading Schedule for determining the level of fire protection in a city. See: "Standard Schedule for Grading Cities and Towns of the United States with Reference to their Fire Defenses and Physical Conditions" (New York, Chicago, San Francisco: National Board of Fire Underwriters, 1956, with 1963 and 1964 amendments).
- [5] Jane M. Hogg, "The Deployment of the Fire Services in Glasgow in 1980," Needs of the Fire Services, Proceedings of a Symposium Oct. 1968 (Washington, D. C.: Committee on Fire Research, Div. of Engl., National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, 1969).
- Jane M. Hogg, "The Siting of Fire Stations," Operational Research Quarterly, XIX (1968), 275-87.
- [6] Louis Santone and Geoffrey Berlin, "Location of Fire Stations," Systems Analysis for Social Problems (Washington, D. C.: Operations Research Council, 1970), pp. 81-91.
- [7] The methodology of districting has been used in political nonpartisan voter redistricting. See, for example:
- (a) S. W. Hess, J. B. Weaver, H. J. Siegfeldt, J. N. Whelan and P. A. Zitlan, "Nonpartisan Political Redistricting by Computer," Operations Research, XIII (1965), 998-1006.

(b) Cronde, Inc., REDIST, Version 3.3, Program Description and User Manual (New York: National Municipal League, 1967).

- [8] L. C. Santone, G. Berlin, Location of Fire Stations, Presented at WORC Symposium on "Systems Analysis for Social Problems," May 26-28, 1969.
- [9] D. Valinsky, "A Determination of the Optimum Location of Fire Fighting Units in New York City," Operations Research, III (1955), 494-512.
- E. Nilsson, J. Swartz, "Applications of Systems Analysis to the Alexandria, Virginia Fire Department," NBS Report 10 454, January, 1972.
- [10] P. S. Mitchell, "Efficient Allocation of Fire Department Resources," Fire Technology, 1971, pp. 242-327.
- [11] Toregas, Revelle, Swain, and Bergman, "The Location of Emergency Service Facilities," Operations Research, Sept.-Oct., 1971.
- [12] L. C. Santone, G. Berlin, Location of Fire Stations, Presented at WORC Symposium on "Systems Analysis for Social Problems," May 26-28, 1969.
- [13] F. E. Maranzana, "On the Location of Supply Points to Minimize Transport Cost," Operations Research Quarterly, XV (1964), 261-70.
- [14] Also see Richard Jordan, et al., Systems Analysis of Inland Consolidation Centers for Marine Cargo, NBS Technical Note #530, Nov. 1970.
- [15] V. Srinivasan and F. L. Thompson, "A Fortran V Code for Transportation Algorithms," Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, June 1971.
- [16] Copies can be obtained from the National Municipal League, 47 E. 68th St., New York, N.Y. 10021.



# NBS TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

## PERIODICALS

**JOURNAL OF RESEARCH** reports National Bureau of Standards research and development in physics, mathematics, and chemistry. Comprehensive scientific papers give complete details of the work, including laboratory data, experimental procedures, and theoretical and mathematical analyses. Illustrated with photographs, drawings, and charts. Includes listings of other NBS papers as issued.

*Published in two sections, available separately:*

### • Physics and Chemistry (Section A)

Papers of interest primarily to scientists working in these fields. This section covers a broad range of physical and chemical research, with major emphasis on standards of physical measurement, fundamental constants, and properties of matter. Issued six times a year. Annual subscription: Domestic, \$17.00; Foreign, \$21.25.

### • Mathematical Sciences (Section B)

Studies and compilations designed mainly for the mathematician and theoretical physicist. Topics in mathematical statistics, theory of experiment design, numerical analysis, theoretical physics and chemistry, logical design and programming of computers and computer systems. Short numerical tables. Issued quarterly. Annual subscription: Domestic, \$9.00; Foreign, \$11.25.

## TECHNICAL NEWS BULLETIN

The best single source of information concerning the Bureau's measurement, research, developmental, cooperative, and publication activities, this monthly publication is designed for the industry-oriented individual whose daily work involves intimate contact with science and technology—for engineers, chemists, physicists, research managers, product-development managers, and company executives. Includes listing of all NBS papers as issued. Annual subscription: Domestic, \$6.50; Foreign, \$8.25.

## NONPERIODICALS

**Applied Mathematics Series.** Mathematical tables, manuals, and studies.

**Building Science Series.** Research results, test methods, and performance criteria of building materials, components, systems, and structures.

**Handbooks.** Recommended codes of engineering and industrial practice (including safety codes) developed in cooperation with interested industries, professional organizations, and regulatory bodies.

**Special Publications.** Proceedings of NBS conferences, bibliographies, annual reports, wall charts, pamphlets, etc.

**Monographs.** Major contributions to the technical literature on various subjects related to the Bureau's scientific and technical activities.

**National Standard Reference Data Series.** NSRDS provides quantitative data on the physical and chemical properties of materials, compiled from the world's literature and critically evaluated.

**Product Standards.** Provide requirements for sizes, types, quality, and methods for testing various industrial products. These standards are developed cooperatively with interested Government and industry groups and provide the basis for common understanding of product characteristics for both buyers and sellers. Their use is voluntary.

**Technical Notes.** This series consists of communications and reports (covering both other-agency and NBS-sponsored work) of limited or transitory interest.

**Federal Information Processing Standards Publications.** This series is the official publication within the Federal Government for information on standards adopted and promulgated under the Public Law 89-306, and Bureau of the Budget Circular A-86 entitled, Standardization of Data Elements and Codes in Data Systems.

**Consumer Information Series.** Practical information, based on NBS research and experience, covering areas of interest to the consumer. Easily understandable language and illustrations provide useful background knowledge for shopping in today's technological marketplace.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES

The following current-awareness and literature-survey bibliographies are issued periodically by the Bureau:

**Cryogenic Data Center Current Awareness Service** (Publications and Reports of Interest in Cryogenics). A literature survey issued weekly. Annual subscription: Domestic, \$20.00; foreign, \$25.00.

**Liquefied Natural Gas.** A literature survey issued quarterly. Annual subscription: \$20.00.

**Superconducting Devices and Materials.** A literature survey issued quarterly. Annual subscription: \$20.00. Send subscription orders and remittances for the preceding bibliographic services to the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.

**Electromagnetic Metrology Current Awareness Service** (Abstracts of Selected Articles on Measurement Techniques and Standards of Electromagnetic Quantities from D-C to Millimeter-Wave Frequencies). Issued monthly. Annual subscription: \$100.00 (Special rates for multi-subscriptions). Send subscription order and remittance to the Electromagnetic Metrology Information Center, Electromagnetics Division, National Bureau of Standards, Boulder, Colo. 80302.

Order NBS publications (except Bibliographic Subscription Services) from: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**National Bureau of Standards**  
Washington, D.C. 20234

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Penalty for Private Use, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
COM-215

